## **REMARKS**

In the application Claims 1 through 20 are pending: Claims 1-8, 11-14 and 17-19 are rejected and Claims 9, 10, 15 and 20 are objected to. After consideration of the Examiner's comments in the Office Action of March 5, 2003, the claims have been amended as set forth above. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following comments, Applicant submits that the claims are patentably distinct over the cited prior art and requests that the Examiner reconsider the application as amended and issue a notice of allowance.

The Examiner objects to the drawings because the sprocket cited in Claim 10 is not shown in the drawings.

In response, Claim 10 has been amended to eliminate reference to the "sprocket", which was present solely as the result of a typographical error. The word should have been "socket", and the claim has been amend to reflect this correction. Accordingly, no changes have been made to the drawings.

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, 5-7, 11, 12 and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Burdick (Pat. No. 1,430,354).

In response, Claims 1 and 18 have been amended to include additional limitations with regard to the cowl and the collar. Specifically, limitations have been added in Claim 1 that the inner surface of the cowl "is substantially continuous" and the "collar substantially seals the closed end of the cavity against external contaminants." Similar limitations have been added to Claim 18.

It is submitted that the structure of Burdick which corresponds to the cowl, i.e., the outer wall 12, is not substantially continuous because there are many apertures 17, 18 and 19 penetrating the wall. These apertures are designed to "provide for efficient ventilation of the device" (col. 1, line 19). While such openings may be desirable in a light fixture such as a heat lamp which is used indoors and not exposed to the elements, they are highly undesirable in an outdoor fixture since all manner of contaminants will be able to enter the interior of the reflector and corrode, oxidize, or otherwise damage the fixture, leading to premature failure. The substantially continuous structure according to Applicant's invention has no ventilation apertures formed therein. Rather, the only opening(s) in Applicant's cowl permit mounting of or electrical connection to the fixture. Thus, Applicant's cowl has a substantially continuous inner surface which is not disclosed by Burdick.

The structure of Burdick which corresponds to the collar, i.e., inner wall 13, cannot possibly seal the closed end of the cavity against external contaminants such as dirt, moisture or

insects, because the outer wall 12 has a large number of apertures 17, 18 and 19. In the amended claims, the collar is described as "substantially sealing" the cavity because, "while [the combination of the collar and cowl] is not completely watertight, it provides a barrier to entry of moisture, debris, spiders and insects that often collect within the inner cavities of open ended light fixtures" (Application at paragraph [011].) Substantially sealing the closed end of the cavity against external elements is not disclosed by Burdick. In fact, to do so would defeat an important goal of the fixture disclosed by Burdick, which was to provide for efficient ventilation. Furthermore, the use of the combination of inner and outer walls as taught by Burdick would override many of the important advantages provided by Applicant's invention. The collar (inner wall) would act to retain contaminants introduced through the apertures in the non-continuous cowl (outer wall), leading to greatly accelerated failure of the fixture relative to the prior art fixtures mentioned in the Background of the Invention of the present application.

It is submitted that the Burdick patent fails to disclose each and every element of the invention as claimed in the amended claims, and that it, therefore, cannot anticipate Applicant's invention as now claimed. In view of the fact that the remaining claims rejected under §102(b) are dependent from patentably distinct base claims, it is submitted that the prior art rejections of the dependent claims have similarly been overcome. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections of Claims 1, 18, and the claims depending therefrom, under §102(b).

The Examiner rejects Claims 3, 4, 8, 13, 14 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Burdick alone or in view of either Gabrius et al (Pat. No. 6,361,193 B1) or AlTurki (Pat. No. 6,113,433).

Applicant respectfully submits that in view of the foregoing amendments and comments, Claims 3, 4, 8, 14 and 19, all being dependent on patentable base claims, are similarly patentable.

Gabrius et al. is cited for its teaching of a reflector which has its surface coated with high reflectivity powder paint. Al-Turki is cited for its teaching of a bayonet-type mounting. Neither Gabrius et al. nor Al-Turki teach a substantially closed cavity within the cowl, which teaching is missing from Burdick. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the claims as amended are not obvious over Burdick alone or in combination with Gabrius or Al-Turki.

In view of the foregoing amendments and arguments, Applicant submits that all bases for rejection have been overcome and that the amended claims are allowable over the prior art. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the prior rejections and issue a notice of allowance of all claims now in the application.

Should the Examiner believe that prosecution of this application might be expedited by further discussion of the issues, he is invited to contact the undersigned attorney for Applicant using the contact information listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 4, 2003

Eleanor M. Musick
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 35,623

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP 1100 Peachtree Street Suite 2800 Atlanta, Georgia 30309-4530 Telephone: (404) 541-6681 (direct) Facsimile: (404) 541-3317 emusick@kilpatrickstockton.com

Docket No. PA10 [47018/253171]